



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,092	01/07/2002	Lyle N. Scheer	SUN07-01(P6337)	6565
58498 7590 07/21/2008 BARRY W. CHAPIN, ESQ. CHAPIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK 1700 WEST PARK DRIVE, SUITE 280 WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581			EXAMINER DIVECHIA, KAMAL B	
			ART UNIT 2151	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/21/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/042,092

Applicant(s)

SCHEER ET AL.

Examiner

KAMAL B. DIVECHA

Art Unit

2151

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 7-9, 22, 25, 28-35 and 37-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 7-9, 22, 25, 28-35, 37-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Action is in response to communications filed 6/16/08.

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 20, 22, 25, 28-35 and 37-39 are pending.

Claims 3-6, 10-19, 21, 23-24, 26-27 and 36 were previously cancelled.

Claim 20 is cancelled in response filed 6/16/08.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), **was filed 6/16/08** in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed **on 6/16/08 has been entered**.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims above have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by the substantial amendments, more specifically in view of "deploying respective images onto plurality of servers from a single user action".

Thus, all previous responses in light of Abboud and Steitle still apply, and are herein incorporated by reference.

Telephone Interview

An attempt was made by the examiner on 6/30/08 in order to clarify the potential typographical errors with respect to claim 40, but was unsuccessful in reaching the representative Christopher Lutz, and a voice message was left.

Applicant's representative Christopher Lutz returned the Examiner's call on 7/8/08 and the error with respect to claim 40 was discussed. In response, applicant acknowledged the translation error and the following correct version of the claim was submitted for examination:

40. (New) A method, comprising:

receiving a design list for a plurality of components in a network, the design list comprising functions of a deployment network upon which the components are to be deployed, the received design indicative of the components in the network, each component responsive to a particular digital image file for performing operations based on the design list;

receiving design rule logic including a set of design rules indicative of links interconnecting the components,

generating a plurality of network designs for the plurality of components based upon a set of design rules and the design list, further comprising a first network design of the plurality of network designs, the design rules determining that the first network design is for a first component in the network, the first component being a gateway server layered in a network location such that the gateway server is first in receiving all incoming data packets to the network;

configuring software and hardware settings for the plurality of components in the network, the configuration of the software and

hardware settings based upon the design rules and the first network design;

building a respective digital image with the software and hardware settings for each of the plurality of components, each design corresponding to a digital image for a respective component, the plurality of components having a different server type than the first server and operable to support dissimilar operations, building further comprising configuring the digital image corresponding to each network component to include the unique operations settings for the deployment network;

generating each of the digital images files for communicating with the indicated links to the other components; and

deploying each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of components from a single user action, digital images deployed with settings and parameters onto components such that the components operable cohesively without the need to manually adjust the settings or parameters.

Claim Objections

Claim 40 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 40 recites:

“A method comprising...

...

generating each of the digital images files for communicating with the indicated receiving a design list for a plurality of components in a network...;
links to the other components; and
deploying each...

There is a typographical errors, incomplete recitations and/or improper recitations of the limitations in the claim because the limitations “generating, receiving, links” fails to make any logical sense. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the **first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1-2, 7-9, 22, 25, 28-35 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method, comprising:

receiving a design list for a plurality of network servers, the design list comprising functions of the network, amount of hardware for the network, type of hardware for the network and number of WAN IP addresses assigned to the network;

generating a plurality of network designs for the plurality of network servers based upon a design rule and the design list, further comprising receiving a first network design of the plurality of network designs, and wherein the design rule determines a first server in the network is a gateway server layered in a network location such that the gateway server is first in receiving all incoming data packets to the network;

configuring software and hardware settings for the plurality of network server in the network, the software and hardware settings including switches, jumpers, IP address, links, ports and values of software parameters, the configuration of the software and hardware settings based upon the design rule and the first network design;

building a respective digital image with the software and hardware settings for each of the plurality of servers, each design corresponding to a digital image for a respective network server, the plurality of servers having a different server type than the first server and operable to support dissimilar operations; and

deploying each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers from a single user action.

Initially, Applicant has failed to point out where in the specification the support for the amended limitations is found.

Upon review of the specification as filed, it is noted that the specification fails to teach or suggest deploying each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers from a single user action. In fact, there is no description of user initiating the deployment of digital images onto plurality of servers.

At best understood, the master configurer 102 deploys the images onto the corresponding components in the network in order to produce operational server farm, e.g. specification, pg. 5 [0011], pg. 6 [0015], pg. 7 [0018].

However, this is not equivalent to deploying each of the respective digital images onto the plural servers **from a single user action**.

Therefore, the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 2 and 7-9 are rejected due to their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 25, 28-35 and 37-40 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1, 2 and 7-9.

Note: The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections presented in the previous office action is withdrawn in light of claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

The 101 rejection presented in the previous office action is withdrawn in light of amendments filed 6/16/08. Claim 25 is now directed to a physical machine.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 25, 28, 29, 31, 33 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abboud et al. (hereinafter Abboud, US 2002/0184484 A1) in view Steitle et al. (hereinafter Steitle, US 2002/0188700 A1), and further in view of in view of Raymond et al. (hereinafter Raymond, US 6,108,697).

As per claim 25, Abboud discloses an apparatus comprising:

graphic user interface (fig. 6 item #600);

configuring logic to configure network settings, including IP addresses, links and ports for a plurality of servers in the network (pg. 3 block #36);

digital image building logic to build a respective digital image with the network settings for each of the plurality of servers in the network, the plurality of servers having different server

type than the first server and operable to support dissimilar operations (pg. 2 block #15, pg. 5 block #50 and fig. 4B item #459); and

deployment logic to deploy each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers in the network, the second server accessible to network traffic via the first server, digital images deployed with settings and parameters onto components such that the components operable cohesively without the need to manually adjust the settings or parameters (fig. 2, pg. 2 block #16, pg. 3 block #32, 36 pg. 5 block #47, 51, pg. 6 block #61 and fig. 4A item #405; the functionality wherein the components operate cohesively without the need to manually adjust the settings or parameters is inherent and/or obvious with claim 1, 25 because digital images are configured with settings and parameters before deployment).

However, Abboud does not disclose the process of receiving a design list for a plurality of network servers, the design list comprising functions of the network, amount of hardware for the network, type of hardware for the network and number of WAN IP addresses assigned to the network; generating a plurality of networks designs for the plurality of network servers based upon the design rule and the design list wherein the design rule determines a first server in the network is a gateway server layered in a network location such that the gateway server is the first in receiving all incoming data packets to the network; configuring software and hardware settings including switches, jumpers, for the plurality of servers based upon the design rule and network design and deploying logic to deploy each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers from a single user action.

Steitle, from the same field of endeavor discloses the process of receiving a design list for a plurality of network servers, the design list comprising functions of the network, amount of

hardware for the network, each hardware responsive to a particular digital image file for performing operations based on the design list, type of hardware for the network and number of WAN IP addresses assigned to the network; generating a plurality of networks designs for the network servers based upon the design rule and the design list wherein the design rule determines a first server in the network is a gateway server layered in a network location such that the gateway server is first in receiving all incoming data packets to the network (i.e. a firewall server), each design corresponding to a digital image for a respective network server (i.e. design indicates how the digital image is to be imaged for a server) and configuring software and hardware settings including switches, jumpers, for the server based upon the design rule and network design, the second server having different server type than the first server and operable to support dissimilar operations, and wherein the second server is accessible to network traffic via the first server (fig. 2, fig. 4: shows the designed network including servers, firewall, routers, web server, etc., pg. 1 [0012-0015], pg. 2 [0019-0021], [0023-0026]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abboud in view of Steitle in order to design a network and configure the software and hardware based upon the design rule and the designed network.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have allowed a user to design and implement a network comprising servers, routers, firewalls, etc. (Steitle, pg. 1 [0005], [0012]).

However, Abboud and Steitle do not disclose deploying logic to deploy each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers from a single user action.

Raymond discloses deploying logic to deploy each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers from a single user action (col. 3 L14-16, col. 4 L30-54, col. 9 L5-67, col. 16 L16-67: user initiates the one to many deployments of software).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abboud and Steitle in view of Raymond in order to deploy and/or transfer images for plurality of servers by single user action.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have configured plurality of servers at the same time (Raymond: col. 3 L66 to col. 4 L9).

As per claim 2, Abboud discloses a system wherein the network comprises a server farm wherein the network handles variable workloads and wherein all functions of the network continue in the event the second server of the network fails (pg. 1 block#7 and fig. 2, Steitle, fig. 4).

As per claim 7, Abboud discloses the process of dynamically building the digital image (pg. 5 block #49-50 and pg. 6 block #58).

As per claim 9, Abboud discloses the process of rebuilding the digital image for at least one server in the network and redeploying the digital image for the at least one server (pg. 5 block #52, fig. 6 item #600 and pg. 6 block #58).

As per claim 29, Abboud discloses a system comprising a database to store one or more digital images of a server, one or more network topologies, and network configurations (pg. 5 block #55, pg. 6 block#61).

As per claim 31, Abboud does not disclose the process wherein the design rule instructing how a component in a network can or cannot be employed in the network.

Steitle, from the same field of endeavor discloses the process wherein the design rule instructs how a component in a network can or cannot be employed in the network (fig. 2, fig. 4: shows the designed network including servers, firewall, routers, etc., pg. 1 [0012-0015], pg. 2 [0019-0021], [0023-0026]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abboud in view of Steitle in order to provide a rule on how component in a network can or cannot be employed.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 25.

As per claim 37, Abboud discloses the process of determining a server type, the server type indicative of the configured parameters (fig. 6: shows the server type, model number and the platform).

As per claim 38, Abboud in view of Steitle discloses the process of determining for each of the deployed images, cohesive settings operable to interconnect servers receiving the deployed images (i.e. redundant connections, Steitle, fig. 4: design of a network comprising redundant links; Applicant Admitted Prior Art, remarks, pg. 7).

As per claim 39, Abboud and Steitle do not discloses the process of deploying images for a plurality of servers at substantially same time.

Raymond discloses the process of transferring and/or downloading the images for plurality of servers at the same time (col. 3 L14-16, col. 4 L30-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abboud and Steitle in view of Raymond in order to deploy and/or transfer images for plurality of servers at the same time.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have configured plurality of servers at the same time (Raymond: col. 3 L66 to col. 4 L9).

As per claim 40, Abboud discloses a method comprising:

configuring network settings, including IP addresses, links and ports for a plurality of servers in the network (pg. 3 block #36);

building a respective digital image with the software and hardware settings for each of the plurality of servers in the network, the plurality of servers having different server type than the first server and operable to support dissimilar operations, building further comprising configuring the digital image corresponding to each network component to include the unique operations settings for the deployment network (pg. 2 block #15, pg. 5 block #50 and fig. 4B item #459);

generating each of the digital images files for communicating with the indicated links to the other components (pg. 2 block #15, pg. 5 block #50 and fig. 4B item #459); and

deploying each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers in the network, the second server accessible to network traffic via the first server, digital images deployed with settings and parameters onto components such that the components operable cohesively without the need to manually adjust the settings or parameters (fig. 2, pg. 2 block #16, pg. 3 block #32, 36 pg. 5 block #47, 51, pg. 6 block #61 and fig. 4A item #405; the functionality wherein the components operate cohesively without the need to manually adjust the settings or

parameters is inherent and/or obvious with claim 1, 25 because digital images are configured with settings and parameters before deployment).

However, Abboud does not disclose the process of receiving a design list for a plurality of network servers, the design list comprising functions of the network, amount of hardware for the network, type of hardware for the network and number of WAN IP addresses assigned to the network; receiving design rule logic including a set of design rules indicative of links interconnecting the components; generating a plurality of networks designs for the plurality of network servers based upon the design rule and the design list wherein the design rule determines a first server in the network is a gateway server layered in a network location such that the gateway server is the first in receiving all incoming data packets to the network; configuring software and hardware settings including switches, jumpers, for the plurality of servers based upon the design rule and network design and deploying logic to deploy each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers from a single user action.

Steitle, from the same field of endeavor discloses the process of receiving a design list for a plurality of network servers, the design list comprising functions of the network, amount of hardware for the network, each hardware responsive to a particular digital image file for performing operations based on the design list, type of hardware for the network and number of WAN IP addresses assigned to the network; receiving design rule logic including a set of design rules indicative of links interconnecting the components; generating a plurality of networks designs for the network servers based upon the design rule and the design list wherein the design rule determines a first server in the network is a gateway server layered in a network location such that the gateway server is first in receiving all incoming data packets to the network (i.e. a

firewall server), each design corresponding to a digital image for a respective network server (i.e. design indicates how the digital image is to be imaged for a server) and configuring software and hardware settings including switches, jumpers, for the server based upon the design rule and network design, the second server having different server type than the first server and operable to support dissimilar operations, and wherein the second server is accessible to network traffic via the first server (fig. 2, fig. 4: shows the designed network including servers, firewall, routers, web server, etc., pg. 1 [0012-0015], pg. 2 [0019-0021], [0023-0026]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abboud in view of Steitle in order to design a network and configure the software and hardware based upon the design rule and the designed network.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have allowed a user to design and implement a network comprising servers, routers, firewalls, etc. (Steitle, pg. 1 [0005], [0012]).

However, Abboud and Steitle do not disclose deploying logic to deploy each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers from a single user action.

Raymond discloses deploying logic to deploy each of the respective digital images onto the plurality of servers from a single user action (col. 3 L14-16, col. 4 L30-54, col. 9 L5-67, col. 16 L16-67: user initiates the one to many deployments of software).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abboud and Steitle in view of Raymond in order to deploy and/or transfer images for plurality of servers by single user action.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have configured plurality of servers at the same time (Raymond: col. 3 L66 to col. 4 L9).

As per claims 1, 28 and 33, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 2, 7, 9, 25, 29, 31 and 37-40. Therefore claims 1, 28 and 33 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 2, 7, 9, 25, 29, 31 and 37-40.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abboud et al. (hereinafter Abboud, US 2002/0184484 A1) in view Steitle et al. (hereinafter Steitle, US 2002/0188700 A1), further in view of in view of Raymond et al. (hereinafter Raymond, US 6,108,697), and further in view of Haun et al. (hereinafter Haun, U. S. Patent No. 6,751,658 B1).

As per claim 8, Abboud, Steitle and Raymond do not explicitly disclose the process of deploying the dynamically built image over a network connection in response to a net boot request from a first server.

Haun, from the same field of endeavor, discloses the process of transferring the boot image over a network connection in response to a net boot request from a network client (a network computer or server, fig. 3 step# 355, 375, 380, 385 and col. 9 L9 to col. 10 L16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Haun as stated above with Abboud, Steitle and Raymond in order to transfer or deploy the boot image in response to a net boot request from a server.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because net booting approach greatly simplifies network computers client administration and provides a high level of reliability for the network computers and/or servers (Haun, col. 9 L33-36).

4. Claims 22, 30, 32, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abboud et al. (hereinafter Abboud, US 2002/0184484 A1) in view in view Steitle et al. (hereinafter Steitle, US 2002/0188700 A1), further in view of in view of Raymond et al. (hereinafter Raymond, US 6,108,697), and further in view of Li et al. (hereinafter Li, US 6,012,088).

As per claim 30, Abboud, Steitle and Raymond does not disclose the process wherein the number of WAN IP addresses being fewer than the numbers of servers in the network and wherein configuring network settings comprising sending a request to a Domain Name system Server.

Li discloses a system comprising a DNS server, DHCP server and a NAT server that translates host and network addresses (fig. 6 item #236, 238, 210, col. 2 L60-67, col. 8 L15-34: note that whenever a NAT server in configured in the network, It implies that the local network has fewer global or WAN IP addresses than the number of hosts in the network, and the NAT server solves the problem by translating the local IP address to the global IP address).

Therefore, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abboud, Steitle and Raymond in view of Li in order to include NAT and DNS servers in the network.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivate because it would have enabled communications between the local area network (LAN) and the Internet (Li, col. 2 L60-67, col. 8 L24-26).

As per claim 32, Abboud, Steitle and Raymond does not disclose the system wherein configuration means includes a DNS server and a NAT server, the NAT server to route data packets to and from a virtual IP address of the network.

Li explicitly discloses the system comprising a Domain Name system and a network address translator (NAT) for routing the data packets from virtual IP address to the Internet or external network (fig. 6 item #236, 238, 210, col. 2 L60-67, col. 8 L15-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abboud, Steitle and Raymond in view of Li, in order to include a Domain Name server and NAT server.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated in order to enable the local area network (LAN) to communicate with the Internet successfully (Li, col. 2 L60-67, col. 8 L24-26).

As per claims 22, 34 and 35, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 30 and 32. Therefore claims 22, 34 and 35 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 30 and 32.

Additional References

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Malik et al., US 5,832,503: Method and Apparatus for configuration management in communication networks.
- b. Abboud et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,636,958 B2.
- c. Ludovici et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,567,849 B2.
- d. Wilde et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,066,182.
- e. Knox et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,978,911.
- f. Selitrennikoff et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,301,612 B1.

Conclusion

Examiner's Remarks: The teachings of the prior art should not be restricted and/or limited to the citations by columns and line numbers, as specified in the rejection. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

In the case of amendments, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and support, for ascertaining the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is (571)272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kamal Divecha
Art Unit 2151
/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151